APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,230	12/27/2000	Yuhichi Nakamura	JA999-282	5228

7590	06/17/2004

Ronald L Drumheller, Esq.
94 Teakettle Spout Road
Mahopac, NY 10541

EXAMINER
BARQADLE, YASIN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	5

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

> A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
> - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
> - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
> - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
> - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 December 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-42 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs

of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under

this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for
> patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof
> by the applicant for patent, or on an international applicat   ion by another
> who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of
> section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant
> for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American

Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual

Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do

not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly

or indirectly from an international application filed before

November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference

is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by

the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2.   Claims 1,4,11,14,21,24,31,34 and 41 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gadol USPN (5754857).

As per claim 1, Gadol discloses a system which includes a server

apparatus (fig. 2, servers 110-1 and 110-2) including a storage

device (122-1 and 114-1, fig. 2) and a plurality terminal

apparatus (clients 112-1 thru 112-3) connecting to said server

apparatus via a network (Internet/LAN/WAN), a method for

controlling a workflow which is executed by said server,

comprising the steps of:

(a) generating a document which includes data and rules

(rules 146-1) responding to a request from one of said terminal

apparatus and storing it in said storage device [workflow is

dynamically formed by workflow agent in response to client

workflow request col. 5, lines 14-30 and lines 64-67];

b) receiving an update request on said document from

the first terminal apparatus (workflow information request is

received from client 112 col. 5, lines 23-30), determining

whether said update request is appropriate or not, and said

update request is appropriate then executing the update on said

document [request message is validated based on client ID col. 5,

31-44]; and

determining whether said workflow/process was

completed or not, and if not completed then identifying the

second terminal apparatus which can update next and

notifying it [col.6, line 55 to col. 7, line 8].

As per claim 4, Gadol teaches the method according to claim 1

wherein said step (b) further comprises a step of, if the update

request is not appropriate, notifying the first terminal

apparatus [col. 6, line 55 to col. 7, line 8 and col. 9, lines

48-61].

As per claim 11, Gadol teaches a system which includes a server

apparatus (fig. 2, servers 110-1 and 110-2) including a storage

device (122-1 and 114-1, fig. 2) and a flow control (workflow

courier) section and terminal apparatus (clients 112-1 thru 112-

3) connecting to said server apparatus via a network, said flow

control section executing the workflow controlling functions of:

(a) generating a document which includes data and rules

responding to a request from said terminal apparatus and storing

it in a storage device [workflow is dynamically formed by

workflow agent in response to client workflow request col. 5,

lines 14-30 and lines 64-67];

b) receiving an update request on said document from

the first terminal apparatus (workflow information request is

received from client 112 col. 5, lines 23-30, determining whether

said update request is appropriate or not, and if said update

request is appropriate then executing the update on said document

on a database [request message is validated based on client ID

col. 5, 31-44]; and

(c) determining whether processing of said document was

completed or not, and if not completed then identifying the

second terminal apparatus which can update next and notifying it

[col. 6, line 55 to col. 7, line 8].

As per claim 14,24,34 Gadol teaches the invention wherein said

step (b) further comprises a step of, if the update request is

not appropriate, notifying the first terminal apparatus [col. 6,

line 55 to col. 7, line 8 and col. 9, lines 48-61].

As per claims 21, 31, and 41, these claims have similar

limitations as claim 11 above, therefore they are rejected with

the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms

the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office

action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically
> disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the
> differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior
> art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at
> the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the
> art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 2-10, 12-13, 15-20, 22-23, 25-30,32-33, 35-40 and 42

are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Gadol USPN (5754857) in view of Bright et al (2002/0013731).

As per claim 2, although Gadol shows substantial features of the
claimed invention, he does not explicitly show converting a
document into a logic program.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would
have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by
Gadol, as evidenced by Bright et al USPN. (5754857).
In analogous art, Bright et al whose invention is about pre-
processing electronic commerce requests orders, disclose a system
that translate customer order data (documents) into a format of
logical message code [¶ 0023 and 0035]. Giving the teaching of
Bright et al, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have
readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of
modifying Gadol by employing the system of Bright et al because
it is very flexible and simple to implement.

As per claim 3, Bright teaches the method according to claim
wherein said step (b) further comprises a step determining
whether or not said update request is a cancellation request and
if it is, resetting any field of said document related to the
cancellation request, and identifying a terminal apparatus
related to the reset field to notify it [¶ 0041-0043].

As per claim 5, Bright teaches invention wherein said step (b)
further comprises a step of registering the time determined to be
time out when executing the update request, and if time out
occurs, giving predetermined notice related terminal apparatus [¶
0062].

As per claim 6, Bright teaches the invention wherein said step
further comprises a step of, it is determined that the process
ended abnormally, notifying the terminal apparatus [¶ 0036 and
42].

As per claims 7, Gadol teaches the invention as explained in
claim 1 above, except the limitation of:
(c) determining whether or not said update request is a
cancellation request, and if it is, resetting any field
related to the cancellation request, and identifying a
terminal apparatus related to the reset field notify it [see the
rejection on claim 3 above].

As per claim 8, this claim has similar limitation as claim 2
above. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale.

As per claim 9, Gadol teaches the invention wherein said step (b)
further comprises a step of, if the update request is not
appropriate, notifying the first terminal apparatus [col. 6, line
55 to col. 7, line 8 and col. 9, lines 48-61].

As per claim 10 and 20 Bright teaches the invention wherein said
step (b) further comprises a step of registering the time
determined to be time out when executing the update request, and
if time out occurs, giving predetermined notice related
terminal apparatus [¶ 0062].

As per claim 13, 23, and 33, Bright teaches the invention wherein

said step (b) further comprises a step determining whether or not

said update request is a cancellation request and if it is,

resetting any field of said document related to the cancellation

request, and identifying a terminal apparatus related to the

reset field to notify it [¶ 0041-0043].

As per claim 15, 25, 30 and 35, Bright teaches the invention

wherein said step (b) further comprises a step of registering the

time determined to be time out when executing the update request,

and if time out occurs, giving predetermined notice related

terminal apparatus [¶ 0062].

As per claim 16, 26 and 36, Bright teaches the invention wherein

said step further comprises a step of, it is determined that the

process ended abnormally, notifying the terminal apparatus [¶

0036 and 42].

As per claims 17, 27, 37 and 42, these claims have similar

limitations as claim 7 above, therefore they are rejected with

the same rationale.

As per claims 18,22,28,32, and 38, these claims have similar limitations as claim 2 above. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale.

As per claim 19, 29, and 39, Gadol teaches the invention wherein said step (b) further comprises a step of, if the update request is not appropriate, notifying the first terminal apparatus [col. 6, line 55 to col. 7, line 8 and col. 9, lines 48-61].

Conclusion

The prior made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yasin Barqadle whose telephone number is 703-305-5971. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 703-305-4792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Yasin Barqadle

Art Unit 2153

Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner